

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 3-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 herewith. At line 9 of Claim 1, the phrase “at least one” has been deleted and replaced with the term “a.” In addition, at lines 10-11, the phrase “and when a plurality of substituents are present on Ar<sub>1</sub>, they may be the same or different;” has been deleted.

**Response to the Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reisch et al. in Macromol. Chem. Phys. Vol. 200, No. 3 (1999), pp. 552-561 (“Reisch”).

Reisch is relied upon as teaching homologs that are allegedly within the scope of the present claims.

Applicants submit that Reisch does not teach homologs of the presently claimed polymers and that, therefore, Reisch does not render obvious the claimed invention.

Applicants specifically submit that Reisch teaches di-substituted polymers. *See* polymer 11a-e. In contrast, the presently-claimed polymeric substance is mono-substituted. Thus, Reisch does not teach all of the elements recited in claim 1.

Applicants further submit that Reisch teaches away from the present invention. Reisch discloses that mono-substituted PPV possesses poor solubility. *See* page 552, lines 6-10. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the di-substituted polymers of Reisch in order to arrive at the present invention.

Applicants additionally note that the presently claimed mono-substituted polymeric substance exhibits visible fluorescence in the solid state and unexpectedly good solubility. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect the presently claimed substance to exhibit good solubility in view of the disclosure of Reisch.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to Claim 1 as amended, and in view of deletion of the phrase "and when a plurality of substituents are present on Ar<sub>1</sub>, they may be the same or different," Applicants submit that Claim 1 is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Furthermore, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Patrick F. Gallagher  
Registration No. 54,109

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 4, 2004